



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/642,980	08/18/2000	Radhika R. Roy	3493.86280	8413

26652 7590 04/13/2004

AT&T CORP.
P.O. BOX 4110
MIDDLETOWN, NJ 07748

EXAMINER

KADING, JOSHUA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2661

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/642,980

Applicant(s)

ROY, RADHIKA R.

Examiner

Joshua Kading

Art Unit

2661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8, 10-12 and 30-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8, 10-12, and 30-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 August 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5

Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, and 30-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas (U.S. Patent 6,421,339 B1) in view of Tiedemann, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent 5,862,471).

10

Regarding claim 2, Thomas discloses "a method for providing H.323 alias address portability to an H.323 user in real-time H.323 multimedia communications wherein a geographical location is divided into home/visitor zones, and wherein each home/visitor zone has an associated home gatekeeper that maintains a centralized home/visitor location database for home and visitor location information wherein

15

administrative zones of the geographical location [of] the centralized home/visitor location database [are] known and the H.323 user is registered with a home gatekeeper for the home zone of the H.323 user (figure 1, elements 63, 66, 68, 70 are home/visitor administrative domain databases in different zones), comprising the steps of:

20

sending, by the H.323 user, a message with a called H.323 entity's alias address, to the home gatekeeper to originate a call to the called H.323 entity (col. 5, lines 34-37 where the ARQ message contains "Joe@networkA" which is the alias address; col. 5,

Art Unit: 2661

lines 45-46 shows the ARQ message is sent to the home gatekeeper when a call is placed by the H.323 user);

translating, by the home gatekeeper, the alias address to a called routable alias address for the called H.323 entity (col. 5, lines 45-52 where the alias address is in the
5 ARQ message which is sent to the home gatekeeper to translate the alias address into other aliases and lists of gateways, or in other words routing information);

sending, by the home gatekeeper, the called routable alias address to the called H.323 entity (col. 5, lines 59-63 where by signaling the called entity the routable alias address must be sent to the called entity, otherwise the signaling information would not
10 be correctly routed to the called entity; col. 5, lines 23-29 shows the gatekeeper sending and routing the call);

placing the call to the called H.323 entity (col. 5, lines 59-63 where the call signaling is the placing of the call)..."

However, Thomas lacks what Tiedemann discloses, that is "before sending, by
15 the home gatekeeper, the called routable alias address to the called H.323 entity, the home gatekeeper notifies the H.323 user of an approximation of a cost of making the call (col. 2, lines 22-30; it should be noted that although Tiedemann lacks the notification of an approximation of cost in an H.323 system, Tiedemann does disclose a mobile system in which this takes place, for instance the mobile system of Thomas)."

20 It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the notification of an approximation of cost with the rest of the method for the purpose of allowing the user to decide whether or not to place a call

based on the cost of the call. The motivation being that this can save the user money in mobile phone charges.

Regarding claim 31, Thomas discloses "a method for providing H.323 alias
5 address portability to an H.323 user in real-time H.323 multimedia communications wherein a geographical location is divided into home/visitor zones, and wherein each home/visitor zone has an associated home gatekeeper that maintains a centralized home/visitor location database for home and visitor location information wherein administrative zones of the geographical location [of] the centralized home/visitor
10 location database [are] known and the H.323 user is registered with a home gatekeeper for the home zone of the H.323 user (figure 1, elements 63, 66, 68, 70 are home/visitor administrative domain databases in different zones), comprising the steps of:

sending, by the H.323 user, a message with a called H.323 entity's alias address, to the home gatekeeper to originate a call to the called H.323 entity (col. 5, lines 34-37
15 where the ARQ message contains "Joe@networkA" which is the alias address; col. 5, lines 45-46 shows the ARQ message is sent to the home gatekeeper when a call is placed by the H.323 user);

translating, by the home gatekeeper, the alias address to a called routable alias address for the called H.323 entity (col. 5, lines 45-52 where the alias address is in the
20 ARQ message which is sent to the home gatekeeper to translate the alias address into other aliases and lists of gateways, or in other words routing information);

Art Unit: 2661

sending, by the home gatekeeper, the called routable alias address to the called H.323 entity (col. 5, lines 59-63 where by signaling the called entity the routable alias address must be sent to the called entity, otherwise the signaling information would not be correctly routed to the called entity; col. 5, lines 23-29 shows the gatekeeper sending
5 and routing the call);

placing the call to the called H.323 entity (col. 5, lines 59-63 where the call signaling is the placing of the call)..."

However, Thomas lacks what Tiedemann discloses, that is "before sending, by the home gatekeeper, the called routable alias address to the called H.323 entity, the
10 home gatekeeper notifies the H.323 user of an approximation of a cost of making the call (col. 2, lines 22-30; it should be noted that although Tiedemann lacks the notification of an approximation of cost in an H.323 system, Tiedemann does disclose a mobile system in which this takes place, for instance the mobile system of Thomas)."

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of
15 invention to include the notification of an approximation of cost with the rest of the method for the purpose of allowing the user to decide whether or not to place a call based on the cost of the call. The motivation being that this can save the user money in mobile phone charges.

It should be noted that both Thomas and Tiedemann lack implementing the
20 method using a computer program embodied on a computer readable medium, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the method implemented by a computer program. The motivation being that this is the

Art Unit: 2661

only feasible and effective means of implementing a method in a digital communication system.

In regard to claims 3 and 32, Thomas and Tiedemann disclose the methods of
5 claims 2 and 31. However, Tiedemann lacks what Thomas further discloses, that is
“each administrative domain has at least one zone (figure 1, elements 10 and 12 where
each of these domains has at least one zone defined by their respective gatekeepers
and HLR/VLR databases).” It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the
art at the time of invention to include the at least one zone in each administrative
10 domain with the methods of claims 2 and 31 for the same reasons and motivation as in
claims 2 and 31.

In regard to claims 4 and 33, Thomas and Tiedemann disclose the methods of
claims 2 and 31. However, Tiedemann lacks what Thomas further discloses, that is “an
15 alias address assigned to an H.323 user is kept fixed as the user moves from one place
to another (col. 5, lines 5-7 where the roaming user is always referred to as “Joe” and
therefore his alias address is fixed since no matter where “Joe” is he is always referred
to as “Joe”).” It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time
of invention to include the fixed alias address with the methods of claims 2 and 31 for
20 the same reasons and motivation as in claims 2 and 31.

In regard to claims 6 and 35, Thomas and Tiedemann disclose the methods of claims 2 and 31. However, Tiedemann lacks what Thomas further discloses, that is "a domain for an alias address assigned to the H.323 user in an administrative domain is a donor domain (col. 3, line 67 and col. 4, lines 1-11 where "Joe" registers with an administrative domain by way of gatekeeper 44 and is given his donor domain or transient identity)." It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the donor domain with the methods of claims 2 and 31 for the same reasons and motivation as in claims 2 and 31.

In regard to claims 7 and 36, Thomas and Tiedemann disclose the methods of claims 2 and 31. However, Tiedemann lacks what Thomas further discloses, that is "the alias address assigned to the H.323 user is moved from a donor domain to a new domain due to roaming of the H.323 user, the new domain is called a recipient domain (col. 3, lines 45-47 where VU is later identified by his alias address "Joe" as can be read in col. 3, line 67 and col. 4, lines 1-5; where "Joe" is visiting a recipient domain controlled by gatekeeper 44 and he must register with gatekeeper 44)." It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the recipient domain with the methods of claims 2 and 31 for the same reasons and motivation as in claims 2 and 31.

In regard to claims 8 and 37, Thomas and Tiedemann disclose the methods of claims 7 and 36. However, Tiedemann lacks what Thomas further discloses, that is "the

alias address in the recipient domain is referred to as a ported number (col. 5, lines 59-63).” It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the ported number with the methods of claims 8 and 37 for the same reasons and motivation as in claims 8 and 37.

5

In regard to claims 10 and 38, Thomas and Tiedemann disclose the methods of claims 2 and 31. However, Tiedemann lacks what Thomas further discloses, that is “location information for the H.323 user is updated by querying, by the home gatekeeper, location databases during call establishment by the H.323 user (col. 3, lines 60-64 where periodic basis can include during call establishment).” It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the location information being updated with the methods of claims 2 and 31 for the same reasons and motivation as in claims 2 and 31.

15 In regard to claims 11 and 39, Thomas and Tiedemann disclose the methods of claims 2 and 31. However, Tiedemann lacks what Thomas further discloses, that is “the call is placed directly by the H.323 user (col. 5, lines 23-29 although this is saying that the call is placed by the gatekeeper and not the H.323 user, it mentions that this is merely an alternative to having the H.323 user place the call directly).” It would have
20 been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the directly placed call with the methods of claims 2 and 31 for the same reasons and motivation as in claims 2 and 31.

In regard to claims 12 and 40, Thomas and Tiedemann disclose the methods of claims 2 and 31. However, Tiedemann lacks what Thomas further discloses, that is "the H.323 user moves to an administrative domain of the called H.323 entity and the call is placed via a home gatekeeper of the called H.323 entity (col. 6, lines 20-27 where this states that an H.323 user is able to roam and since the H.323 user is able to roam it can place calls as in col. 5, lines 45-52 where the H.323 user communicates with the visited gatekeeper (or the H.323 called entities gatekeeper) which then proceeds with the call setup)." It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the moving to an administrative domain and placing the call via a home gatekeeper with the methods of claims 2 and 31 for the same reasons and motivation as in claims 2 and 31.

In regard to claims 30 and 41, Thomas and Tiedemann disclose the methods of claims 2 and 31. However, Tiedemann lacks what Thomas further discloses, that is "address portability includes, for selected information in the message, having a same source address, a same destination address and different intermediate addresses (col. 5, lines 45-52 where the destination address is the alias address which is constant no matter what and the source address must be present in the message otherwise replies and further communication would not be possible because there would be no return address, the intermediate addresses consist of the list of gateways that must be passed through en route to the destination)." It would have been obvious to one with ordinary

Art Unit: 2661

skill in the art at the time of invention to include the address portability with the methods of claims 2 and 31 for the same reasons and motivation as in claims 2 and 31.

Claims 5 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

5 Thomas and Tiedemann as applied to claims 4 and 33 above, and further in view of Chau et al. (U.S. Patent 5,764,750).

In regard to claims 5 and 34, Thomas and Tiedemann disclose the methods of claims 4 and 34. However, Thomas and Tiedemann lack "the alias address is an E.164 number." Chau et al. however, disclose "the alias address is an E.164 number (col. 2, 10 lines 11-15 show an H.323 environment; col. 23, lines 5-8 and 16-23 show the alias address is an E.164 number and although the alias address in this case is a phone number, as per applicant's specification the alias address could also be a user ID as in Thomas)." It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to make the alias address an E.164 number for the purpose of allowing the 15 gatekeeper to map the address to a network routable address. The motivation being to allow communication over the network.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Kading whose telephone number is (703) 305- 20 0342. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30AM-5PM.

Art Unit: 2661

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas Olms can be reached on (703) 305-4703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the


- 5 Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
- 10 Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Joshua Kading
Examiner
Art Unit 2661

April 7, 2004

15



KENNETH VANDERPUYE
PRIMARY EXAMINER